



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/604,244	07/03/2003	Hung-En Tai	LKSP0017USA	1243

27765 7590 12/28/2004

(NAIPC) NORTH AMERICA INTERNATIONAL PATENT OFFICE  
P.O. BOX 506  
MERRIFIELD, VA 22116

EXAMINER
----------

LE, TOAN M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2863

DATE MAILED: 12/28/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/604,244

Applicant(s)

TAI ET AL.

Examiner

Toan M Le

Art Unit

2863

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 December 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 03 July 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☒ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Oath/Declaration***

It does not identify the foreign application for patent or inventor's certificate on which priority is claimed pursuant to 37 CFR 1.55, and any foreign application having a filing date before that of the application on which priority is claimed, by specifying the application number, country, day, month and year of its filing.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by “Data Mining and Fault Diagnosis Based on Wafer Acceptance Test Data and In-line Manufacturing Data”, Fan et al. (referred hereafter Fan et al.).

Referring to claim 1, Fan et al. disclose a method for analyzing in-line quality control (QC) test parameters (Abstract), the method being used to analyzed a plurality of lots of products, each lot of products comprising a lot number, the products being formed using a plurality of equipments, at least one wafer of each lot of products being tested by at least one in-line QC test item to generate an in-line QC test parameter, the in-line QC test item, and its sample test item and wafer test item being stored in a database, the database further storing the in-line QC test parameter and data of a plurality of lots of high-yield product stocks, such as test

Art Unit: 2863

items and test parameters (page 172, 2<sup>nd</sup> col., Control Policy Re-evaluation section: lines 1-18; figure 1), the method comprising:

analyzing the in-line QC test parameter to determine whether the in-line QC test parameter corresponds to a predetermined spec or not (page 172, 2<sup>nd</sup> col., Fab Data Case Study section: lines 1-6);

searching the database to find out the sample test item or the wafer test item related to the in-line QC test item when the in-line QC test parameter does not correspond to the predetermined spec;

searching the database to find out the corresponding test parameters of the high-yield product stocks according to the in-line QC test item and the searched sample test item or the wafer test item (page 172, 2<sup>nd</sup> col., Fab Data Case Study section: lines 7-15; figure 3); and

generating a correlation to illustrate the relationship between the in-line QC test item and the sample test item, or the relationship between the in-line QC test item and the wafer test item according to the searched high-yield product stocks (page 172, 2<sup>nd</sup> col., Fab Data Case Study section: lines 16-18; page 173, 1<sup>st</sup> col., lines 8-24).

As to claim 2, Fan et al. disclose the method as described above wherein the lots of products are not tested by a sample test process and a wafer test process (page 172, 2<sup>nd</sup> col., Fab data Case Study section: lines 16-18; figure 4).

Referring to claim 3, Fan et al. disclose the method as described above wherein the correlation between the in-line QC test item and the sample test item, and the correlation between the in-line QC test item and the wafer test item are generated using linear regression methods (page 172, 1<sup>st</sup> col., 2<sup>nd</sup> half, and 2<sup>nd</sup> col., Fab Data Case Study section: lines 16-18).

Art Unit: 2863

As to claim 4, Fan et al. disclose the method as described above further comprising: predicting the sample test result of the lots of products according to the in-line QC test parameter not corresponding to the predetermined spec, and according to the correlation between the in-line QC test item and the sample test item (page 172, 1<sup>st</sup> col., 2<sup>nd</sup> half; page 172, 2<sup>nd</sup> col., lines 1-7 and Fab Case Study section: lines 16-18; figure 4).

Referring to claim 5, Fan et al. disclose the method as described above further comprising: predicting the wafer test result of the lots of products according to the in-line QC test parameter not corresponding to the predetermined spec, and according to the correlation between the in-line QC test item and the wafer test item (page 172, 1<sup>st</sup> col., 2<sup>nd</sup> half; page 172, 2<sup>nd</sup> col., lines 1-7 and Fab Case Study section: lines 16-18; figure 4).

As to claim 6, Fan et al. disclose the method as described above wherein the database stores data of a process step related to the in-line QC test item, and the method further comprises:

classifying the lots of products into two groups according to a first spec, the two groups of products comprising a qualified group of products corresponding to the first spec, and a failed group of products not corresponding to the first spec (page 172, 1<sup>st</sup> col., Device variatuin Partition section: lines 1-5);

searching the database to find out the process step related to the in-line QC test item;

finding the equipments used in the process step according to the lot numbers of the two groups of products; and

determining the equipment through which a probability that the failed group of products have passed is higher than a probability that the qualified group of products have passed (page 172, 1<sup>st</sup> col., Key Node Screening section: lines 1-5).

Referring to claim 7, Fan et al. disclose the method as described above wherein commonality analysis is used to determine the equipment through which a probability that a low-yield group of products have passed is higher than a probability that a high-yield group of products have passed (page 172, 1<sup>st</sup> col., Key Node Screening section: lines 1-5 and 2<sup>nd</sup> col., Fab Data case Study section: lines 7-15).

As to claim 8, Fan et al. disclose the method as described above further comprising: searching test results of each of the sample test items and each of the in-line QC test items of the lots of products after a sample test process of the lots of products; and generating a correlation between each of the sample test items and each of the in-line QC test items according to the search results (page 172, 2<sup>nd</sup> col., Control Policy re-evaluation section: lines 1-18).

Referring to claim 9, Fan et al. disclose the method as described above wherein the correlation between each of the sample test items and each of the in-line QC test items is generated by a multiple regression model (page 171, 2<sup>nd</sup> col., 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph).

As to claim 10, Fan et al. disclose the method as described above wherein the correlation between each of the sample test item and each of the in-line QC test items is generated by a stepwise regression model (page 171, 2<sup>nd</sup> col., 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph).

Referring to claim 11, Fan et al. disclose the method as described above wherein the correlation between each of the sample test items and each of the in-line QC test items is illustrated by a residual plot (page 172, 1<sup>st</sup> col., 2<sup>nd</sup> half, equation 1, “ $e_i$  is a modeling residual”).

Art Unit: 2863

As to claim 12, Fan et al. disclose the method as described above further comprising:

searching test results of each of the sample test items and each of the in-line QC test items of the lots of products after a sample test process of the lots of products;

classifying the lots of products into a plurality of groups according to the parameters of each of the in-line QC test items of the lots of products (page 172, 1<sup>st</sup> col., Device Variation Partition section: lines 1-5; figure 3);

analyzing the sample test parameters of each group of products (page 172, 2<sup>nd</sup> col., Fab Data Case Study section: lines 1-6); and

analyzing and obtaining the group of products having the sample test parameters most similar to a second spec when the sample test parameters of the groups of products are different (page 172, 2<sup>nd</sup> col., Fab Data Case Study section: lines 7-15).

Referring to claim 13, Fan et al. disclose the method as described above wherein an ANOVA method is used to analyze whether the sample test parameters of the groups of products are different or not (page 171, 2<sup>nd</sup> col., 2 paragraph).

As to claim 14, Fan et al. disclose the method as described above wherein a Duncans multiple range test is used to analyze and obtain the group of products having the sample test parameters most similar to the predetermined spec (figures 7-9).

Referring to claim 15, Fan et al. disclose the method as described above wherein the classified lots of products are illustrated by a box plot (figure 3).

As to claim 16, Fan et al. disclose the method as described above wherein each of the in-line QC test parameters of the obtained group of products is used as a predetermined spec of the subsequent products (figure 1).

Art Unit: 2863

**Remarks:**

***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 12/7/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Referring to claim 1, Applicant argues that "Fan et al. never mentions any test parameters of high-yield product stocks nor teaches the concept of generating the correlation between the in-line QC test item and the sample test item, or the correlation between the in-line QC test item and the wafer test item according to the search high-yield product stocks."

Fan et al. disclose on page 172, 2<sup>nd</sup> col., Fab Data case Study section : lines 1-6, 'Due to the limit space, this paper skips the device Variation Partition phase and directly uses the lot mean sequence of P<sub>+</sub> contact resistance, Rc\_P<sub>+</sub>, coming from a local foundry fab as an example. In this case study, the parameter Rc\_P<sub>+</sub> was detected to be out of control limit around the 250<sup>th</sup> lot. Fig. 2 illustrates the end-of-line control chart of Rc\_P<sub>+</sub>.'

Thus, Fan et al. do teach test parameters of high-yield product stocks, the concept of generating the correlation between the in-line QC test item and the sample test item, and the correlation between the in-line QC test item and the wafer test item according to the search high-yield product stocks.

***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.**

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO



Art Unit: 2863

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Toan M Le whose telephone number is (571) 272-2276. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 9:00 A.M. to 5:30 P.M..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Barlow can be reached on (571) 272-2269. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Toan Le

December 22, 2004

  
John Barlow  
Supervisory Patent Examiner  
Technology Center 2800